DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 458 910 JC 020 022

TITLE	Florida Community College System Governance Survey. Data Trend.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Board of Community Colleges, Tallahassee.
REPORT NO	No-22
PUB DATE	2000-11-29
NOTE	12p.; Prepared by the Office of Educational Services and Research.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Articulation (Education); *Community Colleges; *Educational Administration; *Educational Planning; Local Issues; School District Autonomy; State Action; State Departments of Education; State Regulation; *State School District Relationship; Surveys; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida Community College System

ABSTRACT

The Florida Education Governance Reorganization Transition Task Force was established to recommend a structure as well as an accountability process for a seamless K-20 educational system for the state. In September 2000, the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC) decided to survey its members, the presidents, and the local trustees of the 28 institutions within the Florida Community College System. The survey was an effort to determine what was working well in the current system, where problems existed, and where these individuals felt the various functions currently performed by the SBCC, the Division of Community Colleges, and local institutions should be housed. Seventy-eight useable responses were received. Some of the responses were the collective answers of the entire board of trustees at a given institution. No attempt was made to weight these responses differently than those of an individual. Findings of the survey include: (1) 95% felt it was very important or important to work collaboratively with colleges to prepare and coordinate implementation of the system's legislative goals; (2) 81% felt it was very important or important to plan, organize, and coordinate programs to enhance equal access and opportunity; and (3) 54% felt it was very important or important to administer the Florida Virtual Campus. (NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 458 910

FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

PUTTING MINDS TO WORK

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. maxwell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Governance Survey

Prepared by:

Office of Educational Services and Research

Data Trend 22

November 29, 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

IC022022

FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

PUTTING MINDS TO WORK

STATE BOARD OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

CHAIRMAN
Sherry Plymale

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
J. David Armstrong, Jr.

VICE-CHAIR
Norman Tripp
Fort Lauderdale

John M. Belohlavek
Tampa

C. Ronald Belton
Jacksonville

Randolph E. Berridge
Maitland

Tom Gallagher
Commissioner of
Education

Randall W. Hanna
Tallahassee

Joseph H. Lang
St. Petersburg

George I. Platt, III
Fort Lauderdale

Violeta B. Salud
Lake Wales

George Thomas
Bradenton

Silvia Velazquez
Student Member
Hialeah

Alberta K. Wilson
Rockledge

Introduction

The Florida Education Governance Reorganization Transition Task Force was established to recommend the structure as well as an accountability process for a seamless K-20 educational system for the State. The Structure Subcommittee of the Task Force is considering both the administrative levels that will exist in this new system and the responsibilities each level will have. In September 2000, the State Board of Community Colleges (SBCC) decided to survey its members, the presidents and the local trustees of the twenty-eight institutions within the Florida Community College System (FCCS). The survey was an effort to determine what was working well in the current system, where problems existed and where these individuals felt the various functions currently performed by the SBCC, the Division of Community Colleges (DCC) and local institutions should be housed.

Survey

The survey consisted of a list of activities. Respondents were asked to provide two types of information for each activity. The first was a rating of how well the entity currently conducting the activity was doing. The scale was 1 – very well, 2 – well, 3 – neutral, 4 – poorly, and 5 – not well at all. Respondents were also given the option of 6 – don't know, for those who were unfamiliar with the activity. The second part of the survey asked each respondent to recommend where the activity should be placed in the new structure with 1 – the local board of trustees, 2 – the new State Board of Education, or 3 – other. For the activities currently conducted by the DCC, respondents were asked to use an importance scale of 1 – mission critical, 2 – very important, 3 – important, 4 – nice to do, 5 – not necessary, or 6 – no opinion.

Seventy-eight useable responses were received. Some of the responses were the collective answers of the entire board of trustees at a given institution. No attempt was made to weight these responses differently than those of an individual.

Highlights

- The average rating for financial activity was 1.3. The average rating for instructional and administrative activities was 1.7. The average rating for the Division was 2.1. All of these fall within the "very well" to "well" range. This means the respondents felt that the entity conducting the activity was doing so in an appropriate manner.

- The respondents believe that local control should be maintained.

- The respondents believe that the division of responsibilities between local control and a state level board (currently the SBCC) is appropriate.

- The respondents want local control over hiring presidents, setting curriculum, admission policy, fees, assessing institutional effectiveness and ensuring access to higher education.

- The respondents want the State (currently the SBCC) to assess system effectiveness and accountability, ensure adequate financial resources for the FCCS, develop and maintain a system level data base, administer statewide programs such as the College Center for Library Automation (CCLA) and the Florida Academic and Counseling Tracking System (FACTS), and provide for coordination of the System.

- The respondents want the DCC to represent the System to the Legislature, Cabinet (acting as the State Board of Education), and other internal and external agencies, and to work collaboratively with the colleges to prepare and coordinate implementation of the System's legislative agenda.

- There was no strong sentiment for the retention of a middle tier board.

- The respondents want to retain the effective system of articulation currently ensured by such entities as the Articulation Coordinating Committee, common course numbering and the various articulation agreements.

Overall, the respondents appeared to believe that the current Florida Community College System was working well and there was no need to make major changes. Most respondents felt the functions currently housed with the SBCC could be handled by the proposed Florida Board of Education. However, there was some concern that the workload implied by making a single board responsible for the entire K-20 system might make it difficult for all issues to receive the attention they deserve.

Tables

The tables included in this report provide a summary of the written comments received as well as detailed information about the results for each activity.

Produced by the Office of Educational Services and Research, Division of Community Colleges
325 West Gaines Street, Suite 1344, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400
For more information, contact Dr. Pat Windham, Director of Educational Effectiveness and Research

Governance Survey: Written Responses
Table 1

Numbered Respondents and their School affiliation if available	***Are there any of these functions you believe cannot be adequately fulfilled by the local board and/or the State Board of Education, and would in your opinion require the creation of a middle tier board, sector specific and coordinating in nature to perform the function? If so, please explain why the local board and/or State Board of Education could not properly fulfill the function, and why you believe the middle tier board would be better able to so serve.*** *(Use additional sheets if necessary)*
1. Edison Community College.	No
3. Unknown	The State Board of Education would oversee the state policies for all education- K-12, Community College and University. A middle tier Board would serve for each one of the three: K-12, Community College and University. The local Boards would take care of their local unit, be it K-12, Community College or University.
4. Unknown	Adequate! Local and State Boards Sufficient!
5. State Board of Community Colleges	We don't need a middle tier board. We need a larger state board with appropriate committees.
6. Group response from Brevard Community C.	Providing that extreme care is taken to appoint State Board members who are not captive of any of the component educational systems, there is no reason why a single Board of Education cannot function adequately. A middle-tier board is not necessary. The community college sector Chancellor and staff should be able to handle all middle-tier function.
7. Central FL Community C.	I would like to see all the educational power given to ONE board. We need to make sure that local control be maintained at a local level. This local control has worked to the benefit of the students and should continue as such.
8. Hillsborough Community C.	None
9. Indian River Community C.	No
13. Indian River Community C.	The less bureaucratic layers the better. Go Local whenever possible.
14. Indian River Community C.	No- No more layers.
15. Summary of Surveys by the Tallahassee CC District Board of Trustees	No.
16. Manatee Community C.	Don't know enough about the middle tier to make an intelligent comment. If the local community college staff told me it was important, I would probably support it.
17. Manatee Community C.	I believe the State Board of Education and/or the Local Boards should establish an office of equal opportunity to monitor the admission of students and the hiring of administrative and teaching staffs.
20. Polk Community College	The Community College System has worked well. It's result and performance oriented. It's cost effective. It's the most flexible and responsive public education system in a rapidly changing economy. I'm concerned that this will create more bureaucracy for us, less flexibility to local needs- and too much power in 1 person's hands.
21. Polk Community College	No
22. Seminole Community C.	Many of the functions I have identified for the "coordinating" board will require cross section coordination that I feel the State Board would not have the time to deal with at this level of detail. (Coordinating Board: Instructional A,B,C,H,M; Financial F,H; Administrative B,C,L,M,Q,R,S,T,U,V,AA.)
23. South Florida Community C.	I do not necessarily believe that a middle tier board is needed- But something will need to coordinate, etc. The Division of Community Colleges staff under a Director/Chancellor could handle most of those functions. All of the recommended functions marked "3" could be handled by the Division of Community Colleges. (Instructional G,H,K,L; Financial A, Administrative A,B,C,D,M,N,O,R,S,T,U, V,W,Y.)

Governance Survey: Written Responses Table 1 Continued	
Numbered Respondents and their School affiliation if available	***Are there any of these functions you believe cannot be adequately fulfilled by the local board and/or the State Board of Education, and would in your opinion require the creation of a middle tier board, sector specific and coordinating in nature to perform the function? If so, please explain why the local board and/or State Board of Education could not properly fulfill the function, and why you believe the middle tier board would be better able to so serve.*** *(Use additional sheets if necessary)*
27. Seminole Community College	My rational for at least one middle tier coordinating board is that there are too many details for one SBE to deal with and many of the issues out across educational sectors (i.e.-articulation, student access, new institutions, etc.)
29. Seminole Community C.	Too much details for a State Board. Better articulation among sectors.
30. FCC Jacksonville	No.

Governance Survey: Written Responses
Table 2

Numbered Respondents and their School affiliation if available	***Other Activities*** *If there are other activities that were not listed that you would like to see considered, please list them in the space provided below and provide your recommended* ***level of governance.***
1. Edison Community C.	Delegate to local boards all powers and responsibilities necessary for efficient operation of the Community College. Local Governance
4. Unknown	All considered. In fact it seems there is some redundancy
7. Central FL Community C.	Middle tier board- although mention this should maintain local level achievements and control.
8. Hillsborough Community C.	None
12. Indian River Community C	Governance Level 1 and 2
15. Summary of Surveys by the Tallahassee CC District Board of Trustees	None.
20. Polk Community C	Seamless System- use the State Board to eliminate taxpayer funded competition for higher education students. Our competition is the private sector. Eliminate duplication and refine focus. Create incentives for cooperation and collaboration efforts, i.e. joint-use facilities, mentoring programs, libraries, Upward Bound, talent search, childcare, etc. State Board Governance
21. Polk Community C	None
22. Seminole Community C.	Mission critical to include and insure "2+2" stays intact.
29. Seminole Community C.	Maintain "2+2" structure between Community Colleges + State University System.

Governance Survey: Written Responses
Table 3

Numbered Respondents and their School affiliation if available	*General Comments*
2. Unknown	I believe in Local control; however, local board system is very weak in that boards are at the total mercy of local administration for information. Because of this local boards are susceptible to manipulation by administrations with good selling skills who are willing to slant or "spin" information. Because local boards have no fact finding ability, they are easily controlled. Local boards or even individual board members need fact finding assistance.
4. Unknown	Too Long! Some redundancy.
6. Group response from Brevard Community C.	The existing Councils (Presidents, CIA, CSA, CBA, etc.) need to be retained and continue in their current roles. The local colleges should hire and discharge their presidents without state level involvement. Local college budgets should be established, approved, and executed by the local board without state level involvement. This survey instrument is very poorly designed with many questions seeking single responses to multiple components, lack of definition of certain functions, and generally confused.
7. Central FL Community C.	Design a coordinating board for the level of community colleges very similar to the SBCC developed.
9. Indian River Community C.	Keep in place. 1. Common Course Numbering 2. CCC and Articulation among SUS and CC 3. Maintain local autonomy 4. Select and release President, control contracts Budget decisions made locally 5. Lump sum budget received.
10. Indian River Community C	We and other community colleges are individual we need to keep decisions on a local level.
11. Indian River Community C	It is very important to coordinate and maintain effective articulation between Community Colleges and State University System. The Common Course Numbering System and Statewide Articulation Agreement must be maintained. Also, very important to preserve local control in governance and lump sum funding to the college with local development of the budget.
12. Indian River Community College	Maintain local autonomy (hiring of Presidents and local finance). Also maintain local budget decision making articulation of common course numbering system.
14. Indian River Community C.	Difficult for Trustee to determine especially with only one year of experience.
18. Pensacola Junior College	The Florida Community College System works very well and is exemplary nationwide- Please leave it alone!
19. Pensacola Junior College	Important to maintain local control of community college boards and "2 plus 2" articulation agreements with the community colleges and university system.
20. Polk Community College	We cannot be locally responsive, flexible, and continue to create reliance on increased foundation funding without local control. We do not need greater and more costly bureaucracies. If we can combine a strong proactive and visionary workforce program with greater articulation, access, and cooperation in the "2+2" system, we will be the best CC system in the U.S.- and the most cost effective higher education state.
21. Polk Community College	3- Presidents
24. South Florida Community College	Good Survey Content- look forward to the results.
25. South Florida Community C	Maximum Control should be left at local level.

Governance Survey: Written Responses Table 3 Continued	
Numbered Respondents and their School affiliation if available	***General Comments***
26. Valencia Community College	I am concerned about equitable funding. The "Hold Harmless" clause cripples Community Colleges that are growing and who have growing needs. I am concerned that all CC's have equal representation in the new paradigm.
28. Pasco-Hernando Community College	Local control is the most important factor in all phases of education.
30. FCC Jacksonville	Under Institutional Activity- items designated as SBCC are obsolete with advent of PBF. Outcomes drives funding drives Institutional decisions. Also many duties ascribed to SBCC is really the division.
31. Central Florida Community College	"3" in the "Recommended" section represents a coordinating board for Community Colleges- very similar to current SBCC. (Instructional A,B,C,G,H,I,J,K,L,M; Financial B,C,E,F,H; Administration A,B,C,F,J,L,O,Q,R,S,T,U,V,W,X,Y,Z,AA, DD,FF,II.)

Sorted by Importance Scale Column 1 (Mission Critical)

Division Activities	Rating Scale Score	Importance Scale Score 1	2	3	4	5	6
E. Work collaboratively with colleges to prepare and coordinate implementation of the system's legislative agenda	2.04	72%	23%	5%	0%	0%	0%
M. Represent the colleges and the system to the Legislature, the Cabinet, and other internal and external agencies, associations and organizations	2.40	68%	26%	3%	1%	1%	0%
V. Coordinate the CCS/SUS Course Prerequisites for the AA degree	1.72	62%	25%	12%	1%	0%	0%
F. Work collaboratively with colleges to develop and coordinate trustee training and development activities	1.83	46%	38%	12%	1%	3%	0%
C. Develop AS curriculum frameworks	2.12	42%	29%	12%	11%	3%	3%
J. Authorize use of the Division budget	1.77	40%	21%	16%	0%	3%	19%
G. Work collaboratively with colleges to develop, coordinate, and implement a public information and communication plan for the system	2.38	40%	38%	16%	1%	4%	0%
O. Plan, organize, coordinate development/implementation of programs to enhance equal access and opportunity	2.09	40%	41%	12%	4%	3%	0%
N. Formulate and recommend policies to the Board to ensure compliance with state and federal equity laws	1.88	37%	47%	11%	5%	0%	0%
D. Provide legal research and support to Division staff and SBCC	1.73	36%	31%	25%	0%	2%	5%
A. Produce research reports such as Data Trends and Fast Facts	2.09	36%	42%	15%	4%	0%	3%
Y. Coordinate Accountability Activities	2.25	34%	32%	26%	1%	1%	5%
I. Staff consortium efforts to provide direction for statewide community college technology and distance learning efforts	2.45	31%	38%	19%	0%	12%	0%
K. Work collaboratively with the DOE to maintain Division employee personnel records and administrative requirements	2.00	29%	19%	32%	4%	3%	12%
L. Maintain accountability for all internal and external documents related to the business of State Board and the Division	1.76	29%	30%	30%	0%	3%	7%
R. Respond to inquiries related to equal access and equal opportunity for students and employees	1.94	29%	38%	10%	19%	4%	0%
W. Administer the Florida Virtual Campus (in cooperation with the SUS)	2.51	25%	29%	23%	9%	9%	4%
B. Conduct Program Reviews including on-site visits when necessary	2.11	23%	25%	28%	10%	9%	3%
P. Provide instruction and coordinate submission of all federal/state-required reports	1.74	23%	56%	16%	3%	0%	1%
X. Administer the Florida Academic Counseling and Tracking for Students program	2.27	22%	41%	31%	3%	0%	3%
Q. Conduct site visits and provide technical assistance to strengthen college practices for special populations	2.33	20%	37%	21%	18%	4%	0%
S. (Per statute) Serve as advisor/consultant on the State College Reach-Out Program Advisory Council	2.00	11%	31%	29%	25%	3%	1%
U. Coordinate K-16 Access Challenge Activities	2.30	11%	44%	22%	10%	3%	10%
T. Serve as equity staff liaison between college personnel, DOE, BOR, OCR, SREB and other agencies as needed	2.16	8%	29%	40%	8%	4%	10%
H. Staff the not-for-profit board of the statewide foundation in furthering system goals and activities	2.78	4%	29%	31%	14%	19%	3%
	Ave. 2.109						

For these activities please use the following rating scale: 1 - very well, 2 - well, 3 - neutral, 4 - poorly, 5 - not well at all, 6 – don't know; Please use the following importance scale: 1-Mission Critical, 2- Very Important, 3- Important, 4- Nice to Do, 5-Not Necessary, 6-No Opinion